

University of Dayton
eCommons

[ECAS Minutes](#)

[Academic Senate](#)

4-16-2012

2012-04-16 Minutes of the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate

University of Dayton. Academic Senate. Executive Committee

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.udayton.edu/ecas_mins

Recommended Citation

University of Dayton. Academic Senate. Executive Committee, "2012-04-16 Minutes of the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate" (2012). *ECAS Minutes*. 260.
https://ecommons.udayton.edu/ecas_mins/260

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Senate at eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in ECAS Minutes by an authorized administrator of eCommons. For more information, please contact frice1@udayton.edu, mschlangen1@udayton.edu.

Approved
Minutes of Executive Committee of the Academic Senate
April 16, 2012
St. Mary's Hall Room 113B

Present: Paul Benson, Corinne Daprano, George Doyle, Jesse Grewal, Jonathan Hess, Emily Hicks, Antonio Mari, Leno Pedrotti, Carolyn Phelps, Joseph Saliba, Rebecca Wells

Absent: Andrea Seielstad

Guest: James Farrelly, Allie Michel

Opening Meditation: Corinne Daprano opened the meeting with a meditation

Minutes: The minutes of the April 2, 2012 ECAS meeting were approved.

Announcements: The next meeting of ECAS is April 23, 2012 from 1:30-3:00 PM in SM 113B.

J. Hess announced that per ECAS' discussion last week, he will follow up with Tom Westendorf to make sure that the Registrar consults with the APC next fall, even if they are simply following a 4-year implementation of the new calendar.

J. Hess reported that the Science Center is not available on Nov. 16, 2012 for an ASenate meeting. ECAS agreed to hold the meeting in Sears Hall instead.

New business

Faculty workload document. J. Hess initiated a discussion of whether or not the Workload Guidelines document requires legislative authority or consultative action. R. Wells stated that she favors legislative authority because the Senate is responsible for matters regarding faculty status and matters related to decisions regarding faculty status. She feels that workload is tied to the faculty evaluative process. L. Pedrotti agreed if the Guidelines were related to Promotion and Tenure and used in the P&T process then the document requires legislative authority. P. Benson objected on the basis that: 1) the document is not a policy statement only guidelines; and, 2) the Workload Guidelines don't directly specify how faculty workload in each unit should be allocated.

L. Pedrotti asked if the purpose of the document was to specify what an appropriate allocation of faculty time. R. Wells stated that the Guidelines were meant to initiate the development of unit policies because currently there are unit variations in faculty workload allocations. J. Farrelly noted that the purpose of the original Workload Guidelines was to define how departments/units can take established expectations regarding research, service, and teaching and create fair and equitable guidelines. He noted that legislative authority seemed appropriate because the 12 hour principle was contract bound. R. Wells suggested that UD faculty are expected to be involved in all 3 activities (research, teaching, service) but that things may change over time. The orientation of the FAC was that the allocation of these faculty responsibilities is up to the departments/units. The changes to the document reflect all aspects of a faculty member's responsibility. L. Pedrotti suggested that the document needs consultation by faculty and administrators noting that some information in the document seems applicable to legislative authority and some to consultation.

J. Saliba noted that each UD faculty member is contractually responsible for 12 units of teaching. If faculty are actively engaged in research that number then decreases to 9 units. He also noted that there are existing inequities among the units regarding the guidelines and that enforcement issues are a concern. He stressed that the Workload document cannot be classified as one that requires legislative authority. L. Pedrotti asked if the faculty have the right to strike this document down. J. Saliba answered that the Board of Trustees has authority over this matter and not the faculty. R. Wells stressed that setting 12 hours per term as a contractual issue is not realistic when we are competing with other universities for faculty. J. Saliba noted that the current faculty handbook already stipulates 12 hours of teaching.

J. Hess requested that ECAS take a vote as to how the Workload Guidelines document should be classified. As a result there were 7 votes for consultation, 1 for authority, and 2 abstentions. ECAS will recommend to the ASenate that the document should be classified as consultative. He also noted that if the Senate thinks the document requires legislative authority then faculty forums to review and discuss the document will be required. If there is a strong sense from the ASenate that this document requires legislative authority or there are objectives to the Workload Guidelines and Outside Employment policy documents they can be discussed and tabled. In addition, after a suggestion from ECAS, J. Hess will ask Linda Hartley (FAC chair) to remove the words “must” and “expect” from the Workload Guidelines document before it is sent out to Senators and faculty for review prior to the April 27 ASenate meeting.

Agenda for April 27 meeting. ECAS approved the following agenda items for inclusion on the April 27 ASenate meeting agenda:

1. Undergraduate Degree Program Proposal Process: Amendment to Senate Document 94-10 (APC)
2. Workload Guidelines (FAC)
3. Outside Employment Policy (FAC)
4. Updates on DOC 07-05
3. Election of new officers

There was some discussion of the UDPPP document (Senate DOC 94-10 Amended). G. Doyle suggested that item 2.2 should also include the process required to rename an academic unit as well as a department. ECAS noted that there does not appear to be a specified process for renaming an academic unit. C. Daprano asked what happens when a department splits into two separate departments. Would that require following the new department approval process? C. Phelps stated that a department split would follow the new department approval process as outlined in the document.

J. Saliba suggested that J. Hess send out an email to the faculty stressing the need to review these ASenate documents prior to the April 27th meeting. Sending the documents to Senators and faculty a week ahead of time allows for faculty feedback. This feedback is critical especially regarding documents that are consultative in nature.

Update on Department of Language proposed name change

P. Benson reported that the Department of Languages is proposing changing its name to the Department of Global Languages and Cultures. He stated that the new name will reflect a more accurate description of the department. The change will also impact faculty hires and the curriculum. J. Hess noted that this requested change will not happen this spring, but should be an ASenate action for fall.

Ballot for ECAS on 4/27

ECAS reviewed the ASenate ballot for voting at the April 27 meeting and made a few corrections.

Judicial Review Committee (JRC) member for 2012-2015. J. Hess reported that Bill Fischer and Debra Monk reviewed the list of first year Senators who are eligible to serve on the JRC. These Senators include: R. Kurt Mosser, John McCombe (re-elected), Andrew Ewvaraye, Carolyn Phelps (re-elected), Ralph Frasca, John White (re-elected), George Doyle (re-elected), and Harry Gerla. ECAS voted unanimously to favor the following three candidates: C. Phelps, J. White, and H. Gerla.

Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) committee members. ECAS considered the recommendations from Deb Bickford and Steve Wilhoit regarding committee members for the ad hoc SET committee. The following faculty members were recommended: 1) Linda Hartley, chair (CAS); 2) Steve Wilhoit (expertise in this area) (CAS); 3) Jon Hess (expertise in this area) (CAS); 4) Kurt Jackson (experience with assessment) (SOEAP). J. Hess also reviewed D. Bickford's rationale for proposing such a small committee: 1) small allows for speed and nimbleness-- people can be invited in for various parts of the work, to review work and etc., without having to be involved in everything from the beginning. In addition, the group will be working in the summer, and the attempt is to limit the number of people being called to work during the summer: and, 2) some of Senate document's recommendations suggested having people with statistical expertise on the team. We proposed a small number of committee members and saw the possibility of asking people with that expertise to review what is being drafted. We also anticipate working with some national experts, who will also bring expertise.

A. Mari asked what accommodations were being made for student consultation. J. Grewal will be on-campus this summer and volunteered to represent the students on this committee.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:45 PM.

Respectfully submitted by Corinne Daprano

Standing committee work assignments. Below is an updated list of assigned standing committee tasks:

Task	N/C	Prev	To	Work due	Due
*Consultation issue	C	ECAS	ECAS	Work to resolve issues	??
Faculty workload	N		FAC	Report and proposal	Mar. 2
Policy on outside employ	N		FAC	Proposal	??
Committee membership	C	UNRC	UNRC	Complete the list	April 2
Procedure clarification	N		APC	Proc. for dept. change	April
SET committee	N		ECAS	Populate committee	April
Tasks not yet assigned	N/C	Prev	To	Work	due
Tasks ongoing	N/C	Prev	To	Work due	Due
Oversight of CAP dev	N		APC	Hear monthly reports	
Tasks completed by cmte	N/C	Prev	To	Work	due
CAPC voting rights	N		APC	Offer recommendation	Aug. 30
Academic misconduct	C	ECAS	S/APC	Develop form	Sept. 27
Intellectual property rights	C	FAC	FAC	Proposal	Nov. 8
Titles/emeritus	C	FAC	FAC	Proposal	Nov. 8
Launch voting rights cmte	N		ECAS	Proposal	Feb. 29
PA proposal	N		APC	Review	Nov.
*Faculty evaluation (SET)	C	FAC	ECAS	Purpose of eval (revision)	
Academic misconduct	C	APC	S/APC	Develop instructions	
*UNRC policy doc	C	UNRC	ECAS	Review final document	
UDPPP proposal	C	APC	APC	Review Appendix A	

GLC docs (3)	N	APC	Review	??
Student honor code	N	SAPC	Review for issues	??
*Voting representation	N	Ad hoc	Report and proposal	Feb. 29